

THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (MEETING 102 - 12.03.12)

Held at the National Tramway Museum, Crich, Matlock, Derbyshire, on Monday 12th March 2012 at 2pm.

Issue: 1

Present: Messrs, J Markham (Chairman), A. K. Thorpe (Minutes Secretary), I.M. Dougill (Secretary); J Soper, M.C. Wright, G.C.G. Wilton; A. Smith

102.1 Apologies for absence:

Mr. N. Sturgess,

102.2 Minutes of Meeting 101 (26.09.11)

Agreed.

102.3 Committee membership

MCW proposed and IMD seconded Laura Greaves appointed to committee. Unanimously agreed.

Dates of 2012 meetings:

Monday 25 June, 2pm

Saturday 22 September, 2pm

102.4 Bandstand Area – Subscriber Plus

JM and MCW went to inspect the Bandstand area this morning. JM said that he was extremely impressed at what had taken place there and passed on his thanks to JS for all of his work on the project. JS reported that it is intended that the project will be finished this month. The telephone box is due to be delivered this month. Total cost is £75,000, fixed price contract.

Agreed that there would be some reduction to the number of trees on the east side of the line to ensure positive view of the Bandstand Area from the entrance, subject to ensuring stability of the land. **ACTION Richard Sykes**

Agreed that trees proposed within the scheme would not be included to ensure views into the park.

It was discussed that there is still a street lamp and a number of signs to be installed which would 'dress' the area, however, these items are not included in the current budget. Other ideas discussed included kerbing to the south west side of the area. JS said that there is kerbing in stock.

It was agreed that a phase 2 project brief would be compiled. Subscriber Plus could be used to fund this when it has been replenished. Jim has written an article for the next journal and this will include details proposed for phase 2. Agreed that JS would work up a phase 2 proposal that can be put to the Subscriber Plus fund **ACTION JS**

GW formally proposed that Derby College have a horticultural department and they have indicated that they would be keen to maintain and manage formal flower beds in the park. JS suggested the embankment adjacent to the path to the tram stop would be an ideal location. GW said that the students would design an appropriate scheme of the period. It was agreed that we should invite them to pilot this project. Formally supported by this Committee **ACTION GW to invite a formal proposal from the College**

102.5 Next HLF application

See 102.13.

102.6 Benches and Memorials

IMD reported that AT had written a paper and that Hazel and Jeff Quarmby are working up proposals for a house style of bench that can be used. Requests for locations will be invited but this is not guaranteed. Benches are guaranteed for 10 year or the life of the bench. This was proposed by IMD and seconded by MCW.

MCW asked what the process is when a plaque gets handed in because the bench is life expired. IMD said the family could be approached to see if they wanted to replace the bench. AT said that the paper that he had prepared proposed a memorial wall on the steps from the street to the picnic/play area. The intention is that such plaques will be fixed to the wall surrounding these steps.

102.7 Members Accommodation

JS circulated drawing and a report detailing a terrace of houses and shops to the north of the Red Lion. MW reported that the Society has received a quarter of a million pounds in legacies which the Board wanted to invest in a long term project.

The intention is that the Façade would front onto bedsits that would be rented out to people not necessarily associated with the Musuem. A lively discussion ensued regarding the proposals.

AS was concerned about the size of the bedsit units. He considered that they were too small and would not result in the intended rents. He suggested amending the first floor to create two units. AS also said that it is essential practice for any organisation to be in possession of a minimum of 2 quotes and this should be the case for any TMS contracts.

GW was concerned about whether the Museum's existing services would cope with the additional units.

AT was concerned of the security implications of people unknown to the Society being on site when the Museum is closed. He considered this to be a serious risk to the trams and Museum in general.

It was noted that the total cost is significantly more that the money that is available. MCW suggested that in any case we should undertake the groundworks and install a retaining wall, with a view to the funding for the project coming forward in the future. Hoarding or a grassed garden for the Red Lion (on which a marquee could be placed for events) could be placed on the site in the meantime. **ACTION JM to seek approval for this element from Board**

AS asked whether any approval is needed to undertake the groundworks. Planning Permission and Building Regs would be required for the building works.

ATsuggested that a three storey building with Members accommodation at ground floor level and rentable space at 2nd and 3rd floor level might be more appropriate.

Everyone thanked JS for his work which enabled the debate to take place.

With regard to Members accommodation MCW noted that although not normally within our remit, the Board had asked the Committee to consider a report that Richard Sykes had produced which suggested a cost of £170,000 to demolish Field House and rebuild a 6 bedroom house for use as Members Accommodation, but which would allow us to sell it if the Museum ever needed to raise capital. JS was very doubtful that a 6 bedroom property could be built for this sum.

There was some debate about whether Field House was in such a poor state that it needed to be demolished. The general view of the Committee was that it was not in that state and was probably only

in need of renovation. It was agreed that the Board would be informed that a structural survey should be undertaken to confirm this before any further decision is taken **ACTION JM to report to Board and instructed that an independent structural survey be commissioned**

GW said that Derby College had indicated a willingness to undertake the necessary works to Field House if that were necessary.

AT said that if Field House is found to be structurally unsound, it would be better to invest the money in building accommodation in the street rather than demolishing and rebuilding Field House in any case.

102.8 Wakebridge

The Peak District Mining Society have prepared some signage, however, unfortunately it is not in the most appropriate style/interpretation.

102.9 Storage facility

GW reported that whilst a storage facility is probably not financially viable at the moment, we need much more secure storage of our artefacts, eg our copper etc.

102.10 Town End area Inc. landscaping

It was considered that Derby College might be able to install suitable foundations, wall and fence in front of the bank **ACTION GW**

AT noted that action needs to be taken with regards to repairing and painting the shelter which is in a terrible state and the wooden sets are frost damaged. AT said that it is a very public area which all visitors see when waiting for their tram ride and needs urgent action.

ACTION JM to raise at Board to ensure that outside works deal with this

102.11 Use of the Craft Cottage

A permanent membership display will be installed in Craft Cottage. It will also be used for event control by the events team.

102.12 Alternative use for Indoor Play Area

There is a proposal to move the indoor children's play area into a portacabin (in a location yet to be determined) in order that the space be used to store trams.

The Committee considered that it was essential to have a children's play area in the centre of the museum in its current location.

It was also considered that with the proposed moved of G&I14 there would be sufficient space for trams in any case.

102.13 Location of the proposed Memorial Hall

GW reported that we could submit a lottery bid for a Memorial Hall and allotment. If it were located north of the Bridge, in addition, it could be linked to a project with Derby College to build a cul-de-sac of houses which could accommodate admissions etc.

MW said that his preference was that commercially the Memorial Hall should be located south of the Bridge. There was a long debate as to whether or not this would be the case. At a vote JS, GW, AT and AS voted in favour of a location north of the bridge. AT said that his vote was based on there being no loss of visitor car parking. It was agreed that a drawing would be necessary. It was therefore agreed that JM reported to Board that the preferred location was north of the Bridge **ACTION JM**

MW reiterated his strong feelings and views that from a special events point of view he did not support the location of the Memorial Hall in that location as it would not be commercially viable. GW did not support this view.

IMD said that once the works to the Park were completed the area north of the bridge would have a whole new focus.

GW reported that a lottery pre-application meeting has been agreed for April.

103.12 Any Other Business

The Development Report/Development Strategy will be included on the Agenda for the next meeting.

103.14 Dates of Next Meeting

Monday 25 June, 2pm